



City of Annapolis

Department of Planning & Zoning

145 Gorman Street, 3rd Fl

Annapolis, MD 21401-2535

PlanZone@annapolis.gov • 410-263-7961 • Fax 410-263-1129 • TDD use MD Relay or 711 • www.annapolis.gov

Historic Preservation Commission

February 10, 2015

The Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) of the City of Annapolis held its regularly scheduled public meeting on February 10, 2015 in the City Council Chambers. **Chair** Kennedy called the meeting to order at 7:37pm.

Commissioners Present: **Chair** Kennedy, **Vice Chair** Leahy, Finch, Kabriel, Toews, Phillips, Zeno

Staff Present: Craig-Historic Preservation Officer, Theimer-Brown

Chair Kennedy introduced the commissioners and staff. She stated the Commission's purpose pursuant to the authority of the land use articles and administered the oath en mass to all persons intending to testify at the hearing.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Ms. Craig distributed a copy of the HPC 2014 Annual Report that was provided to the City Clerk's Office. She noted that Ordinance #O-5-15 that was referred to the HPC for review includes changes to the proposal for the flood management program/plan for the City and has a direct reference to historic properties.

D. VIOLATIONS

Vice Chair Leahy requested a report on the status of the banners on the St. Anne's Church fence and staff agreed to provide a report at the February 26, 2015 administrative hearing. She also agreed to follow up and provide a report on 15 College Avenue at that time as well.

E. CONSENT DOCKET

4. **98 Duke of Gloucester Street** – James Bowersox – Eliminate two front entry doors and one window and replace with a single front door and window. Front porch restoration. Add a masonry retaining wall along St. Mary's Street with wood picket fence above wall and the relocation of rear porch steps to align with rear porch door. **(Approved as conditioned in the staff report)**

6. **116 Charles Street** – Susan C. Adams – Replace gutters and downspout. Install solar panels on rear standing seam roof and dormer roof. **(Approved as conditioned in the staff report)**

8. **3 Cumberland Court** – Michael Dowling – Install wheelchair lift on front of residence with modifications to existing porch and the construction of a one story addition on the rear elevation. **(Approved as conditioned in the staff report)**

Vice Chair Leahy moved to approve the applications for 98 Duke of Gloucester Street, 116 Charles Street, and 3 Cumberland Court as conditioned on the consent docket. Mr. Toews seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously in a vote of 7-0.

F. OLD BUSINESS

1. **3 Revell Street** – Mary Ann Treger – Enclose a portion of the existing first floor deck and terrace area below. Construct terrace deck above the first floor enclosure and install new windows and relocate existing doors.

Chair Kennedy reminded members of the status of the application for 3 Revell Street explaining that testimony was heard and closed. The HPC had entered into discussion and deliberations specifically relating to whether the application complies with guideline A.3. From these discussions, it was clear that a majority of the commissioners were not going to approve the application as presented so the applicant agreed to continue the application for further amendments with hope of bringing it into compliance with HPC guideline A.3. **Chair** Kennedy had originally announced that no rebuttal testimony would be accepted but since agreed to reopen the record to allow for rebuttal testimony from those who were present and spoke at the January meeting.

Ms. Craig responded to questions from Mr. Lomax regarding whether the application complies with HPC guideline A.3 and the standards applied. She responded to questions regarding the age of the structure and whether it is noncontributing; whether the variance was approved for the rear yard work; whether the proposal does or does not distract from the view shed of adjacent historic properties specifically the Sheahan house; whether the proposed addition respects the architectural character of the historic properties; and whether the focal points and materials are defined.

Mr. Reithlingshoefer testified on drawings and view shed explaining that he has reviewed the calculation provided by Mr. Sheahan referred to as Exhibit K. He discussed the view shed diagram provided and described what part of 83 Shipwright Street view shed is impacted by the proposed addition indicating that it is approximately 3.85%.

Public testimony opened at 8:26pm and those speaking on the application are noted below.

Name	Address	In Favor	In Opposition
Richard Sheahan	83 Shipwright St.		X
Catherine Sheahan	83 Shipwright St.		X

Chair Kennedy accepted the following exhibits into the record.

Exhibit Number	Exhibit Types
G	Chesney letter dated 2/4/15
H	Tarrant Lomax corrected letter dated 2/9/15
I	1982 Photograph of 83 Shipwright Street
J	Historic Site Field Survey Report for 83 Shipwright Street
K	Rebuttal Testimony to Richard Sheahan
L	Richard Sheahan rebuttal testimony dated 2/10/15
M	Catherine Sheahan rebuttal testimony dated 2/10/15

Chair Kennedy explained that anyone wishing to submit written rebuttal testimony should submit it by close of business on February 24, 2015 so that it can be heard at the March 10, 2015 meeting. She reminded commissioners that this is an open case and commissioners should not discuss it outside of the meeting. The applicant waived his right to a 45-day ruling.

HPC recessed at 9:00pm and reconvened at 9:03pm.

2. 123 Conduit Street – Replace windows, doors and transoms on enclosed porch at rear of residence.

Chair Kennedy clarified that this is a continuation of an application regarding windows. Ms. Craig mentioned that the applicant made a good faith effort to provide the supplemental information requested by the HPC however the construction detail is still missing. Mr. Dowling explained that the information needed relates to the construction detail showing the head jam, sill, typical right/left jam conditions for the doors and windows so the profile can be evaluated. Ms. Craig suggested that the HPC review the information provided to give guidance. She suggested that if the HPC okay delegating the final construction detail to the consulting architect for guidance to staff.

Vice Chair Leahy moved to approve the amended application for 123 Conduit Street conditioned that the detailing of the window installation be reviewed by staff prior to installation and documentation be placed in the files. Mr. Kabriel seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously in a vote of 7-0.

G. NEW BUSINESS

7. Dock Street, Randall Street & Compromise Street – City Dock Bulkhead Replacement – Phase II.

Chair Kennedy informed those present for the Dock Street application that there will not be deliberations or decisions made at this meeting to allow for submittal of additional information.

Ms. Schwab explained that Phase II of this project is a continuation of Phase I and that the bulkhead project is a funded project planned to begin in October 2015. The elements of the project consist of demolition and a cantilevered sheeting style bulkhead to encourage little disturbance, however there will be some disturbance to the pedestrian area surrounding the bulkhead. The new pilings, electrical pedestals, electrical connection boxes will affect the view and all other work will be in keeping with what currently exists. There will be little to no change to the area known as the dingy landing and a 5% disturbance with the brick pavers being removed to be replaced in kind. On the Donner Lot, the pedestrian walkway will be replaced with a wooden boardwalk style similar to the Susan B. Campbell Park. She discussed the process for protecting the Alex Haley statue and plaques that will be removed and put back in kind. The existing lamps will be removed, stored offsite and replaced to their existing locations.

Ms. Sherry Johnson-Marsh, Historian, explained that the impacted materials date back to the 1960s or later to include the walkways, bulkhead and dock area so are not historic. She does not expect to encounter any artifacts during construction and because of the approach taken, does not believe there will be any adverse impacts to the historic resources.

Ms. Lisa Greco discussed the City's need for the bulkhead and referred to some photographs in the packet that document the deterioration of the bulkhead. She noted that funding has been obtained through a federal boating infrastructure grant to offset some of the costs of upgrading facilities i.e. improving some of the boat slips to bring up to standard. She described the height of the pilings and the need for the height. She concluded that there will be upgrading of the electrical to bring it up to standard and the cut sheets are in the packet for the electrical pedestals. **Chair** Kennedy expressed concern regarding the height of the pilings and suggested reducing them. Mr. Walters explained the need for the spacing between the pilings which are driving the need for the number of pilings.

Mr. Jeff Evans, Engineer, addressed questions regarding the construction detailing specifically regarding the types of caps proposed for the timber piles indicating that copper caps will be used for the pilings 6-ft or higher and the smaller caps will be the vinyl black caps. The sheet piles will consist of black epoxy coating. He briefly discussed the process for protecting the statues that described in the performance specification. Ms. Lisa Greco added that there will be a seismic monitoring during the construction project.

Staff: Ms. Craig restated her written staff report specifically the items requested by Mr. Dowling.

Public: Public testimony opened at 9:59pm and no one from the public spoke in favor or opposition of the application so **Chair** Kennedy declared the public hearing closed 9:59pm

Commissioners: The applicant agreed to continue the application and waived the 45-day requirement.

The following Commissioners made a site visit on this application.

Name
Kennedy, Phillips, Leahy, Toews, Kabriel, Zeno, Finch

Chair Kennedy accepted the following exhibits into the record.

Exhibit Number	Exhibit Types
D	Additional Specifications
E	Before and After Graphics
F	Large Scale Set of Drawings
G	Sheet piling material sample

1. 32 Maryland Avenue – Michael G. Halbig – Replace six (6) dormer windows – **(WITHDRAWN)**

2. 120 Duke of Gloucester Street – Jan van Zutphen/City of Annapolis – Tree removal

Mr. van Zutphen discussed photos of the two maple trees and noted that one of the trees is dying and the decay of the tree is posing a safety hazard so recommended removing the tree as quickly as possible to be replaced with a healthy tree. He has been in discussions with Miss Utility and there are no utilities in the area. He discussed stump grinding is presenting a problem for replanting in the same location.

Staff: Ms. Theimer-Brown restated the written staff report and recommended conditional approval as detailed in the report dated January 27, 2015.

Public: Public testimony opened at 10:23pm and those speaking on the application are listed below.

Name	Address	In Favor	In Opposition	Commented On
Frederica Struse	120 Duke of Gloucester			X
Rick Struse	120 Duke of Gloucester			X

No one else spoke in favor or opposition to the application so **Chair** Kennedy declared the public testimony closed at 10:32pm.

Commissioners: **Vice Chair** Leahy believes that replacing two trees would be compliant. Ms. Finch believes that replacing two would be more appropriate if different species are used. Mr. Toews believes that in order to maintain the symmetry of the house both trees should be replaced. Ms. Zeno agrees. Mr. Kabriel suggested removing just one tree. A majority of the members present do not believe that the application is compliant as submitted with the one tree removal request. Mr. van Zutphen agreed to discuss with his supervisor amending the application and also waived the right to a 45-day ruling. **Chair** Kennedy remind commissioners that this is a live application so there should not be any discussion among commissioners outside of the meeting.

The following Commissioners made a site visit on this application.

Name
Kennedy, Leahy, Toews, Phillips, Zeno, Kabriel, Finch

Chair Kennedy accepted the following exhibits into the record.

Exhibit Number	Exhibit Types
A	HPC Application time date stamped 12/31/14
B	Staff report dated January 27, 2015
C	Letter from Donna Ware 2/10/15
D	Photographs of 120 Duke of Gloucester

3. 56-58 Maryland Avenue – Dan Petro – Install concrete paver parking pad. **(CONTINUED)**

- 5. 96 Market Street** – Joseph M. Poerio – Install black wrought iron gate with brick side walls to front of house; add a matching black wrought iron railing on top of brick walls; install a brick patio over the left half of the front area behind existing brick wall; install 2' x 3' basement window on the front left side of house with security grill. **(WITHDRAWN)**

J. PRE APPLICATION

Chair Kennedy reminded those present that this is an informal discussion and held as a courtesy to the applicants to determine feasibility as well as to address any other issues of concern that may arise at the hearing. This review does not constitute an approval and nothing discussed in this session will be binding on the commissioners or applicants.

1. 98 Duke of Gloucester Street – James Bowersox – 2nd floor rear addition

Mr. Plitt noted that the owner is proposing a second floor rear addition and went over the site plan noting that there is an existing one story addition on the rear of the house. There are existing dormers and a screened in porch that has existed since the 1950s. He is proposing to move the screened porch and restore the original bay as well as adding a second floor addition.

Chair Kennedy summarized that the application for 98 Duke of Gloucester Street consists of a large rear addition along with siding and some decking. The HPC believes that the retention of the Four square roof form with its rear dormer is going to be a more compliant solution to this expansion and to look at ways to reduce the massing so the historic core continues to be the dominant feature of the architecture. The HPC will be looking at compliance to HPC guidelines B.6, B.8, D.4, D.23 and D.24 for the second floor deck. There were some concerns regarding sizing of the small side addition on the elevation and a desire to provide detailed history of the evolution of the house by section. Most of the historic windows will remain and the non historic will be replaced with more consistent fenestration.

2. 5 St. Mary's Street – Purple Cherry Architects – New Construction.

Ms. Ashley Marshall noted that this is removal of an incompatible building and the proposal will allow the building to be more compatible with surrounding buildings. She discussed the features of the proposal specifically the splitting of materials; the soffett has been reduced in depth; the front door has two side lights; and some of the windows in the bathrooms have been reduced.

Chair Kennedy **summarized** that the applicant was given guidance that demolition needs to focus on integrity, craftsmanship and the 1970 addition. There was discussion regarding the two sets of materials, the brick first floor and wood second floor, the HPC is open to it with concerns but believes the specification of color can overcome some of those concerns. The applicant needs to look at the number and complexity of elements overall such as brackets and panels; boxing depth around the windows; prominence of the side porch in relationship to the front door porch; also look for exciting solutions for the front roof problem and provide focus on the existing trees.

2. 122 Main Street – Purple Cherry Architects – New one-story addition with two-story façade.

Mr. Kuchta discussed some of the minor changes specifically the wing wall; brought the glazing slightly forward. Other concerns relate to the materials and he provided cut sheets of materials for review.

Chair Kennedy **summarized** that this is a pre application for 122 Main Street and there are issues of the glazing on the first floor all the way down to grade whether it has any precedence within the half block radius on either side of Main St. and if not, what would be the solution of changing that element.

With there being no further business, Ms. Phillips moved to adjourn the meeting at 11:52pm. Ms. Zeno seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously in a vote of 7-0.

The next meeting is scheduled for February 26, 2015 at the City Council Chambers.

Tami Hook, Recorder